



Early Journal Content on JSTOR, Free to Anyone in the World

This article is one of nearly 500,000 scholarly works digitized and made freely available to everyone in the world by JSTOR.

Known as the Early Journal Content, this set of works include research articles, news, letters, and other writings published in more than 200 of the oldest leading academic journals. The works date from the mid-seventeenth to the early twentieth centuries.

We encourage people to read and share the Early Journal Content openly and to tell others that this resource exists. People may post this content online or redistribute in any way for non-commercial purposes.

Read more about Early Journal Content at <http://about.jstor.org/participate-jstor/individuals/early-journal-content>.

JSTOR is a digital library of academic journals, books, and primary source objects. JSTOR helps people discover, use, and build upon a wide range of content through a powerful research and teaching platform, and preserves this content for future generations. JSTOR is part of ITHAKA, a not-for-profit organization that also includes Ithaka S+R and Portico. For more information about JSTOR, please contact support@jstor.org.

DISCUSSION.

DAVID KINLEY: I fear that I am not able, from the brief examination that I have had opportunity to give the paper before us, to do full justice in whatever point of criticism I may have to offer.

I think we are indebted to Professor Tuttle for laying so much emphasis upon the social point of view. The labor question, the position of the laborer, is something to consider from the point of view of society as a whole. We have had the social point of view emphasized in economic discussions in recent years. It is society that has become the producer, society that has become the consumer; it is society that determines values and determines prices; it is society that has done this and that. Although it seems to me that the idea of "society's" acting is sometimes pushed too far, the fact of its application in theories of production and distribution excuses its application here.

I was impressed especially by one of the points made in the paper, and the failure to carry it to its logical conclusion. The consideration of the condition of the workingman, from the point of view of society should be a consideration of the proper status of the working-class as part and parcel of the producing group. That is a very different question from the consideration of evils incidental to the existing status of the workingman; yet it is to the consideration of a single one of that class of evils that Professor Tuttle has devoted the main part of his paper. The discussion of the proper status of the working-class, as one of the factors of the production, is mentioned in the last page or two in connection with the quasi-property right which many think

the workingman has in the productive system of which he is a factor. The main purpose of the writer, however, is to provide a remedy for one evil that exists in the present status of workingmen, rather than suggesting possible development for the improvement of the status of the workingmen as a group, and as one of the factors of the producing system. Nevertheless, we must not underrate the importance of what is put before us,—either the importance of the evil mentioned, or the significance of the proposed remedy.

The workingman occupies a certain status as one of the factors of the group of productive elements. There are certain evil things in that status. It is proper to ask what progress has been made in the elimination of the evils incident to the existing status of the workingman in the past ten, twenty-five, fifty years. We are accustomed to answer the question by saying that wages have increased so much, and prices have gone down so much, and therefore the workingman's condition is better off. I take it, however, that Professor Tuttle thinks that such figures do not after all furnish us an adequate answer. The real point at issue is not whether the workingman to-day is in the same status, socially and economically, that he was fifty years ago; but whether the status of the workingman, when compared with the status of other classes, is better than it was in a similar comparison fifty years ago. It is true that the workingman is less certain of employment than he used to be before the introduction of machinery; it is also true that machinery has offset that loss by furnishing a larger quantity of goods for the individual workingman. But this does not necessarily prove, it seems to me, that the status of workingmen as a group, one of the groups engaged in the production of wealth, is any better than it was, when

compared for instance with the progress in the condition of the employer, on the one hand, and the capitalist on the other.

We have been accustomed to think of the workman from the employer's point of view, and the employer's point of view is to look upon labor very much as he looks upon machinery,—as one of the factors which he uses in getting his product. The advantage of the social point of view is that it regards the laborer not with reference to the employer, but as a social group, and measures his progress by the relative readjustment from time to time, of his group to others, as groups, and not as individuals. The important question is : Has the laboring class benefited as much as have other classes from the economic progress of the century? This is a very different question from asking whether we can find a remedy for the irregularities of employment. There are some things to be said in favor of an affirmative answer to the question I have just asked, and to my mind not the least important is the attitude taken in the recent New York labor conference, which, after all, only reflected or crystalized, the public opinion which favors the recognition (as Professor Tuttle put it toward the end of his paper) of quasi-property right on the part of the laborer in the instruments of production he uses, in the business of which he is a part. It seems to me there is no more encouraging mark of progress in the whole range of this labor question than in the acknowledgment that was made by man after man, at that conference, in public discussion, of the laborer's right to a voice in some phases of the policy of the business of which he is a factor. Now I do not mean to admit any right on the part of the employee to manage the business of his employer. I wish simply to emphasize the fact that public opinion

no longer recognizes an unlimited right of the employer against the employee to say "this is my property and I will do as I please with it, and you get out." Public opinion says that such a position may not be longer tolerated, because the securing of fair play in industrial life concerns society as a whole. But this view must not be pushed too far. The employer's rights are equally entitled to protection, and I think there is some danger of forgetting this. A happy solution is to be found somewhere between the two extremes. If the opinion comes to be established that the laboring man, as such, is to have a voice in the settlement of labor affairs and of the productive processes of which he is so large a part, I think we shall have taken a most important step in advance and one that will be of great advantage for the future of society.

Some recent occurrences, however, seem to indicate a loss in the status of the working class. I refer especially to what I have always felt has been the extraordinary extension of the powers of the courts in the use of the injunction, which, it seems to me, has placed a weapon in the hands of the employing class, to the disadvantage of the laboring class, that neither his own welfare nor justice between the parties requires. I am speaking now of this matter in the light of public policy, not as a matter of law. It is sound law, of course, for the highest tribunal of the land has so decided. It is a fact that the extension of the injunction was based upon an interpretation of a statute passed for an entirely different purpose, and not upon a logical deduction from the previous use of the injunction, as the injunction had been used for three hundred years. That, it seems to me, is a step backwards, not perhaps in the mere use of the equity arm of the law for such purposes,

but in the extent to which the thing has been pushed. So the position of the laborer to-day, from the social standpoint, has been advanced by the recognition of his quasi-right to a voice in the management of industry, and has been put a step backward by the curtailment of his rights in the labor contract.

To come now to the particular phase of the question that Professor Tuttle discussed. The ethical principle on which he bases his alleged right of the workingman to compensation is not altogether new. It is not the assertion of a new ethical principle, nor, indeed, the assertion of a new legal principle. As a matter of fact it is simply the application to labor of the principle that law and equity have recognized from the time since there have been English law and equity. When the public takes the property of a man to build a railroad, it indemnifies him; it takes his support away and gives him something for it. Professor Tuttle, it seems to me, applies the general principle underlying this action in another direction. He makes society say to the workingman, "we are making progress at your expense; we will try to see to it that the expense is not altogether yours." But whether his particular proposal to indemnify the workman by giving him a sum of money raised by taxation, partly general and partly specific, is a practicable and wise measure, is a different question. If we attempt to put such a scheme into practice, we would run against the old objection that we would cut the nerve of initiative. If we say to the working class, or to any other class, "here is an easy way to get free from difficulties incident to your employment without effort on your part," we are likely to deaden individual enterprise. It seems to me, therefore, that wisdom requires that we should not do this; that whatever

share society takes toward improving the life conditions of the laborer, toward giving part of the benefit of industrial progress to those who suffer from this very progress, should be done in a way that will not be doing one kind of mischief while at the same time it is trying to cure another. I am not at all sure that the proper limits of social action would not be reached if whatever funds should be raised should be so applied as to distribute labor in order to meet the requirements made necessary by new inventions, and tide over the superfluous labor until the readjustment has taken place. If we do even that much we encounter another difficulty; if society acts to that extent it is bound also to say to a man, "here is work; now, take this work; you have been thrown out by this improvement or that improvement, but here is an opportunity now for you to go to work and not suffer". In other words, if society undertakes to provide indemnification it must also have the power to control action to the extent of being able to make a man who has been thrown out of work by economic progress go to work when an opportunity offers, whether it is work he likes, or not. Now that is a technical curtailment of liberty, but it is a fair question, as our distinguished President put it last night, whether increased opportunities for economic activity and better life would not really enlarge the sphere of freedom of action, despite the apparent restriction.

I wish to repeat in conclusion, therefore, that while I sympathize with the general ethical proposition laid down by Professor Tuttle, it seems to me that his practical proposal would be difficult, if not impossible, to put into effect; and that he has missed the main point of his subject, namely, the improvement of the

status of the workingman, rather than the elimination of incidental evils in his present status.

SAMUEL M. LINDSAY: To Professor Tuttle's statement of fact in the interesting paper to which we have just listened I have in the main, no objections to offer. As I understand him, the work of the laborer is becoming more highly specialized and more minutely subdivided into effort requiring longer periods for preparation and this movement is likely to be accelerated with further industrial progress. The substitution of machinery for each new labor function is of the essence of progress, but the difficulty of readjustment on the part of the individual workman has become so great and the necessity for more frequent readjustment so marked as to demand social compensation to be derived from the social surplus which is being rapidly increased as a result of this process.

The experience of England in the past twenty years in working out one of the greatest pieces of modern social legislation,—the Workingman's Compensation Act—may be readily applied to the slightly different problem which Professor Tuttle has presented and will serve perhaps as the best concrete illustration of his reasoning. The Workingmen's Compensation Act assumed that the accidents of industry are incidental to the increased productivity of modern industrial organization which makes so large a use of machinery. They hold that the employer out of his enhanced profits due to the use of dangerous machinery or to methods of organization of his labor force involving new risks to life, limb or health, must partially compensate his workmen or in large part carry their risks. Apply this to the risks of displacement or to the dangers of frequent

and prolonged unemployment due to increasing specialization, and ask the state or the employer or both to compensate the individual workman and partially to carry or insure his risk and you have a concrete illustration of Professor Tuttle's main thesis.

We are concerned here only with the theoretical justification of such a plan; in no way with the details of its possible execution. In the first place I would call attention to certain changes taking place in industry which makes it necessary for the employer, following his economic interests, to prevent the rapid displacement of workmen on the scale assumed in Professor Tuttle's discussion. Industrial combinations are perhaps the most significant and far reaching in their effects of all recent changes in the industrial world. One result has been the wider separation of the real director of industrial processes from the workman who does the work. This necessitates the control of labor at long range and therefore means that the modern trust must have a more stable labor force and a more intelligent workman, even in the lower grades, than was necessary under the larger number of smaller employers. If the trust succeeds at all, it must more evenly distribute its production and run its factories night and day and every day in the year. It can therefore give more steady employment and will necessarily seek to keep men it has trained in its own more efficient methods. It will and does seek by all sorts of methods to keep a solid hold on its labor force by offering bonuses, interests in the business, relief and pension features to make it difficult for its men to change from one industry to another, and it seeks also, and this fact is still more to the point in our present discussion, to anticipate industrial changes and to train in advance its

own men for the readjustments in work which the introduction of labor saving devices will demand. In proportion therefore as this consolidation in industry goes on, and may be taken as typical of modern economic progress, there is in the very process itself some compensation for the industrial workmen and some provision to carry his risk.

In the second place, it is worth one's while to consider whether it be not true that present economic conditions require the individual workman to choose at an early age his occupation for life. In most of the well organized industries new men are not admitted in any capacity after they have attained the age of 35 and in many well defined occupations the age limit of admission is 25 years. So far therefore as such industries do not provide within themselves for all necessary readjustments of individual workmen they may entail great hardship, but the interesting fact is that those industries which have been able to push the age limit for admission down the furthest and have thus reaped the greatest profit from efficient labor have been able to do so only because they recognize the necessity of carrying the risks of both accident and non-employment through compensation relief and pension features. Should the state become an agent for this purpose it might easily check a movement which has already attained some considerable force from the motives of economic interest in private industry.

The state can compensate the individual workman for his losses due to economic progress and may very properly tax the resources to which Professor Tuttle's paper has directed our attention, without danger of interfering with the normal development of the economic

compensation to which I have so briefly, and, in the few minutes at my command, I fear but very vaguely, tried to point. The position of the workman in the light of recent economic progress shows nothing more clearly than the growing need of economic foresight, independence, intelligence and inventiveness, and above all the power to work with others collectively even where there is a sacrifice of individual freedom of action. These are qualities which are the result of what President Ely last evening so aptly called our social heredity and they are the products very largely of education. The compensation the state owes is the maintenance of the best industrial and commercial education not only made available for the children of the workers but for adult workers as well. Adult education in every possible effective form and the maintenance of freedom of thought and of activity will alone suffice to enable the modern worker to use existing economic forces and opportunities in the future as he has in the past to protect his share in the social surplus and in the results of economic progress. Under these conditions virile and efficient workmen will make necessary readjustments, and for those who cannot a wiser and more sufficient public charity will provide and at the same time will eliminate them from the ranks of industrial workers in their own interests as well as in that of their employers and their fellow workmen, and for the ultimate good of the body-politic.

GEORGE ROBERTS: Professor Tuttle's essential point as I understand it is that the benefits of progress are enjoyed by society as a whole, while the losses incident to progress are borne by the individual laborer. There are just one or two suggestions that I desire briefly to

make in that connection. The first is that the laborer himself is a part of the society which enjoys these benefits, and that, while he may not derive benefit from the particular step of progress which deprives him of employment, he has been all his life a beneficiary of a thousand such steps of progress to which he himself made no contribution. The fact that he is daily the beneficiary of such progress in every department of industry is to him ample compensation for the risk or loss which he may incur. On the other hand, while the profits of a given step of progress may be enjoyed by capitalists, the capitalist himself is constantly bearing the risk of having his entire investment wiped out by just such progress. So it seems to me that the benefits are being constantly distributed to all the members of the community, laborers as well as capitalists, and the losses likewise more equitably than any system that could be devised by legislative acts.

THEODORE MARBURG : This is the largest question of our day. The turn the discussion has taken this afternoon is a fitting supplement to the papers and discussions this morning. The opinion has been advanced that our Association in its consideration of this topic should confine itself to the economic aspects of industry and of the labor question. I cannot reconcile myself to this view ; it seems to me most fitting to introduce the element of the ethical. Few of us doubt that the career of unexampled economic activity upon which our country has entered points to ascendancy in the field of industry. What concerns us is to study the forces which are calculated to make our position secure and enduring. There is reason to believe that the cycles of growth and decay that mark the history of nations were

born of conditions that are passing away. It is rash to presume that we shall actually escape the fate of other nations but it should be our care to postpone as long as possible the day of decline and to show some lasting gain to humanity as a result of our activities. That object can be promoted by building up the character of the average man in the United States and to effect this we must give attention to the ethical side of industry and of the labor question. It seems to me entirely fitting that the American Economic Association should endeavor to indicate how far it is safe to go in this direction. If we are not to do it, who is?

What I want to do now is to point out, in a limited way, what we can do and what we cannot do to improve the condition of labor and to develop the laborer, submitting the matter to you in the light of experience as an employer of labor combined with some dozen years of attention to the science of economics.

Mr. Tuttle has suggested indemnity for the man who is displaced by improved machinery. In approaching this question we need as perspective a consciousness not only of the contribution of machinery to wealth, but of the part it has played in increasing opportunity for employment and in increasing wages. The great increase in the number of people following gainful pursuits not only in America, where the phenomenon is partly explained by the existence of new land to be cultivated, but in Europe too, has taken place since the advent of power-machines. It has been shown that in America nominal wages have advanced 82 per cent. and real wages 130 per cent. since 1840. There is no question but that machinery means increased opportunity and increased wages. This gain to the labor world as a whole does not excuse us, of course, from compensating the in-

dividual who suffers from this development provided such compensation can be given safely, but the question of indemnity for the individual unfortunately connects itself with the question of the unemployed generally. The individual who is thrown out by improved machinery becomes one of that great body. The problem of the unemployed is a serious and most depressing problem for society, one which I fear will never be wholly solved. Experience only emphasizes the truth of the saying of Christ, "ye have the poor with you alway." We may lessen the numbers of the submerged class, but there is little hope of abolishing the class, and for this reason: it is not his actual inferiority but his comparative inferiority which causes the individual to be worsted in the struggle. The most worthless tramp in the street is superior to the savage who gloats over the victim he is torturing to death, or to the brute who practices cannibalism. But whilst he progressed through his antecedents, through his progenitors and through his inheritance of an ever better social environment, the whole of society has progressed, and it is his comparative inferiority to those about him which punishes him.

Now suppose the government attempt to remedy this, as has been suggested, by offering work to the unemployed, what would that mean? It would mean that you offer a refuge to all who chose to abandon their existing employment. It would invite expressions of discontent on the part of those engaged in private industry. The workman would be quick to find fault and to throw up his job if he could fall back upon the government to give him work. Very soon the government would be the major or the sole employer, and that means socialism. Under that régime the only way you can exact work from the man who is disinclined to work is to

imprison him, and that is a return to slavery. Private property is the only safeguard against slavery, and private property could not continue to exist on a liberal scale if the government should offer work to the whole body of the unemployed.

As to the workman's right of indemnity and his right to a voice in the management of industry, I think we confuse matters when we talk about rights in that sense. It is much better to appeal directly to social expediency. If it be socially expedient that the worker should be indemnified, and that he should have a voice in the management, let it be done. If it be not socially expedient, he has no right to it.

Now these are some of the things we cannot do ; there are some things we can do. We see this marvelous growth in invention ; we note new instrumentalities of exchange and production multiplied to such an extent, that what is done to-day would have been considered an idle dream a generation ago. Notwithstanding this, we find labor still subject to the heavy burden to which Mr. Tuttle and others have referred. We find labor in many industries with a task unduly hard, with nothing connected with it that is elevating and developing to the man himself. We see him leaving his home in the morning before his children are up, and returning after they are in bed. We see very few laborers accumulating enough to relieve themselves of this strain in their old age. They get higher wages, and more for their wages as time goes on, but much of their expenditure is dictated by the necessity of conforming to the habits of their neighbors. The money they expend on the education of their children, and on better housing and food and on recreation is well spent, but it is a question whether the gaudier appearance of the household and

the fancy dress of the women add much to the household's real happiness.

And here enters a most important consideration. Unless the laborer did expend his wages, and was under the pressure of this necessity of earning a livelihood, I fear we would not get labor for the more unpleasant and harder work of industry. This is a philosophical fact on which the whole question rests. If the labor world were in an independent position, many of our factories would be compelled to close. It is running against this stubborn fact that makes it all the more incumbent upon us to seek ways in which we can improve the laborer's condition in other directions.

The government cannot make the laborer save; it can do but little to increase wages. We come then to the conditions of labor and the first thing that presents itself to us in this connection is the hours of labor. Here, it seems to me, is the opportunity of the government. It can give the laboring man more leisure; it can establish postal savings banks to increase the opportunity and incentive for saving; it can follow the example of Germany and see that the laborer is provided for in his old age. The most important of these steps is that in the direction of shorter hours. The question is too large to go into adequately in this discussion. I must omit arguments; but I should like to give certain conclusions which I have reached after years of attention to the subject.

In 1881 it looked as if shorter hours would be brought about through the efforts of the laborers themselves, but for lack of a concerted action the movement lapsed. The permanent reduction of hours in the building trades was made possible by the fact that in these trades competition is within a limited circumference. In the

general field of industry the individual employer cannot reduce the hours of labor because he would be at a disadvantage with his competitor. The same is true of any single state of the Union. I have reached the conclusion that the object can be attained in a reasonable period only through the intervention of the federal government and that the United States is one of the few countries that could afford the experiment. It is a question which we are inclined to leave to its own solution and whose discussion we are disposed to postpone, but there are two considerations which make it incumbent upon us to act soon. One is the fact that shorter hours must be introduced before our exports of manufactures become too large a percentage of our total exports; the other is that the existence of trusts and the perfection of our industries point to a speedy modification of the tariff, and the maintenance of the tariff is essential to the success of the experiment. It would be rash to hope that the tariff would be restored for the sake of giving shorter hours to labor.

The question is indeed a serious one and calls for great deliberation. Personally I think it would be an entirely safe experiment, particularly if the reduction of hours were gradual through a period of years. The group of men who carried it out would be doing something as far reaching as that which Lincoln did for the black man.

ADNA F. WEBER : The practical difficulties of creating any public or governmental machinery for relieving unemployed workingmen are so great that it might be well to consider what means have been devised by private initiative to secure this end. As is generally known, there has lately taken place in the printing in-

dustry the introduction on a large scale of new labor-saving machinery,—the type-setting machine. Ordinarily such a movement would have resulted in the retirement of a host of intelligent, well-paid artisans and the substitution in their place of a much cheaper grade of labor. The distress that such a movement would involve has been avoided by the action of the typographical union, which instead of antagonizing the new machine deliberately agreed to its general introduction, but only under the condition that the machines should be operated by union men at the existing rates of wages, and in many cases, that the hours of work should be shortened. Now it seems to me that this is a great forward step in the method of dealing with displacement of labor. By this system the benefits of invention are not entirely absorbed by the employer, in large profits, and the consumer, in lower prices, but are to some extent shared with the workmen in the trade immediately affected. These workmen secure the permanent advantage of shorter hours, but on the other hand are placed under the temporary disadvantage of having to support a fraction of their number who are temporarily thrown out of employment. It is possible that in other industries trade unions may meet employers in the same way, and thus keep in employment the larger portion of skilled labor without any reduction of wages. In some such arrangement I see more promise of practical performance than in other proposals, while it is supported by the ethical considerations advanced by Professor Tuttle and other speakers.

WILLIAM W. FOLWELL: It seems to me that the trouble with this whole discussion is that it is a purely academic discussion, really not worth our while. We

might willingly grant the whole contention of Professor Tuttle's able and very interesting paper. It is the practical question, how to put such a scheme into operation, which alone needs consideration. It is proposed now to indemnify laborers by means of taxation, or by contributions from employers, or both. The first question arises in regard to this taxation—what kind is it to be? Is it to be direct or indirect, local or state, or shall the whole United States be called upon? If you leave this to local taxation, there would be great inequalities and great confusion. I can't conceive off hand how you are going to work any such scheme of taxation. If you propose to compel the employers to contribute to such a fund, who is going to do it? What kind of authority—national, state or local? In any case, who can see beforehand what employees are most likely to be displaced by new machinery? Nobody can tell. Nobody knows what business will be completely ruined and upset tomorrow by new processes or new machinery. Do you propose then to raise a fund in advance, to be kept in some treasury ready for use when some industry, at some unknown and unexpected time, shall be destroyed by a new process or a new invention? We don't do things that way in the United States. It seems to me the practical difficulties of working any such scheme are too great, and we have merely been engaged in a purely academic and theoretical discussion, which is extremely pleasant, but which, it seems to me, is wholly impractical.

JOHN R. COMMONS: One of the difficulties of the effort to combine ethics and economics is that it places us in the position of the politician who is in favor of the theory but against the practice. We are all of us in favor of indemnifying working men for loss which he

has incurred through no fault of his own. The economic question as I understand it is simply a question of ingenuity. The business of economics is to work out the scheme by which that theory can be put into practice, and we have been listening here to suggestions on that line. It has been mentioned that in the case of accidents the employer, or the business, rather, in European countries, indemnifies the laborer. We might mention also the establishment of employment agencies. There is one example in this country where a state legislature has met this question in a practical way, and I do not know that it has involved any undermining of initiative. The state of Massachusetts some five or six years ago provided for a large construction for supplying water to the metropolitan district. In condemning the real estate in the area of the water shed provision was made for indemnifying property owners. In the same act provision was also made for indemnifying the laborers who were thrown out of employment in those villages. The law was a very simple one. It did not require that the laborers should accept any job which should be offered to them, but it was estimated that on the whole it would take a man six months to find another job, and then provided that any laborer or group of laborers might join in an action before a proper court, and upon proving that they had resided in that place and had had employment for a period of one year, they could collect from the state a sum equivalent to six months' wages. It placed them upon their own initiative and responsibility in the matter of finding a new job and moving out of that town, but at the same it placed the burden of caring for them during this loss of employment, through no fault of their own, upon the state which was to be benefited thereby.

Now, I am not claiming that I have a scheme by which a similar provision could be made for those who lose employment through improvements in mechanical processes. The case mentioned was undoubtedly an enterprise undertaken distinctly by the state with the known result that labor would be displaced. There are more difficult problems of course in the case of laborers displaced by improvements in processes. Probably the difficulty in identifying the laborer who lost the job, would be more important than any other, but it does not strike me that a like difficulty arises in inquiry where the burden should lie. The gain to the employer or the gain to the public is found to be the net income of the employer or the capitalist, or the taxpaying class, and it would seem to me that an income tax, perhaps laid upon corporations, or a tax of similar character would assure, as near as we could possibly assure in any scheme, the advantage gained through increased economics from improved processes. If we set about as economists trying to discover practical means for indemnifying the laborer I think we can find lessons from other countries and different states, and draw upon our own economic foundation for plans which would be practical and would combine theory and practice.

EDWARD T. DEVINE: Professor Tuttle appears to me to have taken hold of one corner of a large problem, from which he has vainly attempted to separate the particular part in which he is interested. It is a curious fact, that those who have become profoundly interested in some one aspect of the great problem of relief, almost invariably begin their propaganda for reform by discovering and insisting upon a great gulf between what they wish to remedy on the one hand, and all other

remedial movements on the other. The fact is, however, that the problem of relief is one, whatever the varying causes that create it. Its urgency and its magnitude have not been realized; more adequate measures are required to meet existing needs. Immigration; the ravages of sickness, and especially of the great scourge, tuberculosis; industrial displacement, both in ordinary times, and especially in times of depression; bad housing conditions, and all the other forces creating dependency, must equally be analysed and understood. When the causes of dependency are found to be social rather than individual, as they are in many instances, we must discover by what method the burden can be transferred from the individual and the family, who now suffer vicariously as an incident to industrial and social progress, and placed instead upon the broad shoulders of the community. Professor Tuttle is right in his contention that industrial displacement, to some extent, presents such a case, but wrong in attempting to show that the displaced laborer has a claim different from that of other dependent families, whose claims are equally against society as a whole. No scheme can be devised which will enable us to compensate a laborer for being displaced. Any such scheme, however carefully guarded, would inevitably put a bonus upon inefficiency, since it is the inefficient who in any well managed industrial enterprise are first allowed to go. Society should, as a matter of sound policy meet such a situation, but should meet it with direct reference to the actual experience of the one who is displaced. The nature of the relief supplied,—whether it be cash payment; transportation to some other place, where work is to be had; the supply of tools for new work, or whatever else it may be, must have reference to the past history and the capacity of

the individual who is thus aided ; in other words, the situation must be dealt with as a problem of relief precisely as we would deal with the needs of a family whose breadwinner has died from consumption, a cause of dependency for which the community is itself chiefly responsible.